

## **DRAWING AMENDMENTS**

Responding to the objection to the previously submitted replacement drawings, Applicants enclose herewith, replacement drawing sheets identified in each of the top margins thereof as "Replacement Sheet". Entry of these replacement drawing sheets is hereby requested.

## **REMARKS**

Applicants affirm their provisional election without traverse to prosecute the claimed invention of Group II, namely, claims 12-23 drawn to a receptacle or a coupler. Claims 1-11 are withdrawn from further consideration, as drawn to a non-elected invention.

In the above-referenced Office Action, claims 12-16 and 18-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(b) as anticipated by Nelson, U.S. Patent No. 3,405,488. Nelson shows a housing for covering exposed pipe lengths used in connection with a radiation heating system mounted on the baseboard of a wall. Nelson teaches the use of a housing 24 which snaps over the ends of a bracket 15. Significantly, rounded edge portions 23 clip over lip 26 of bracket 15, rather than engaging or gripping the enclosed pipe 11 itself. In fact, as shown in Figure 2, housing 24 and pipe 11 are always maintained in spaced relation, and pipe 11 plays no part in securing the housing 24 to the wall 13.

Applicants' claimed invention is clearly distinguishable over the teachings of Nelson. The Nelson's housing 24 is not sized and configured to fit snugly over the covered pipe 11. Nelson's housing is not maintained in contingent relation with the covered pipe 11. Nelson's housing is not secured in place against the wall by the pipe 11. Therefore, it is believed that the anticipatory rejection of claims 12-16 and 18-22 based upon the Nelson reference can properly be withdrawn.

Claims 12, 15-17 and 20-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(b) as anticipated by Woods, U.S. Patent No. 3,074,521, issued for a Radiant Panel Assembly. Woods' corner coupling 10 shows lower, horizontal feet 85 and 87, fitted with spacing tabs 89 and 91 and upper flanges 93 and 95, fitted with tabs 97 and 99. Coupling 10 does not have a lower trough, and

relies upon spacing tabs to secure the coupling to the panel 5, as shown in Figure 10. Thus, Woods does not teach or suggest Applicants' claimed construction, nor would one of ordinary skill in the art modify Woods to resemble Applicants' claimed construction.

Applicants urge the Examiner to reconsider the inherent advantages provided by features of their claimed receptacles and couplers. The claimed invention has first and second receivers with upper lips, lower troughs, and inner walls therebetween. These structures are maintained in contingent relation with respective surfaces of the end portions of molding or trim inserted therein, thereby securing the receptacle or the coupler in place against the wall without the use of fasteners or adhesive. These structural features and their inherent advantages are not shown or suggested in the prior art of record.

For all the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of pending claims 12-23 be reconsidered. It is also requested that new claim 24, drawn to a receptacle for connecting two or more pieces of crown molding, be allowed. A favorable action on the application is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

RODNEY J. CLEMENTS, et al.

By   
R. Michael West  
for **Law Offices Of R. Michael West**  
Applicants' Attorney

The correspondence address  
for this communication is:

R. Michael West, Esq.  
Law Offices Of R. Michael West,  
A Professional Corporation  
455 Capitol Mall, Suite 405  
Sacramento, California 95814  
Telephone: (916)-444-5444  
Fax: (916)-444-5441  
E-Mail: [mwest@saciplaw.com](mailto:mwest@saciplaw.com)